

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Amendments After Final Action

Applicant submits that entry of the amendments herein after final Action is appropriate since the amendments are directly responsive to the new rejections under 35 USC 112 made in the final Action, are made to include the language that the Examiner stated should be inserted into claims 11 and 33 in the Advisory Action, and do not raise any new issues. Applicant submits that the amendments either place the application in condition for allowance or better position for appeal.

Claims 11-33 and 41-43

In the final Action, Claims 11-33 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicant amended the claims in the Response filed March 29, 2007, and in the Advisory Action, the Examiner states:

*Claims 11, line 7 and claim 33, line 6, the phrase "copolymer ionomer" should read
- -carboxylic acid copolymer ionomer.- -*

Applicant has amended claims 11 and 33 as suggested by the Examiner. Consequently, entry of the amendment to claims 11 and 33 is requested and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to note on the record that it is believed that the original description of the ionomers in the claims were proper since these are well-known polymers and the person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered the description to be adequate, and is amending the claims in order to expedite prosecution.

Applicant notes that he has also amended claim 35 in the same manner in case it is later rejoined.

Claims 28-31

In paragraph 3 of the final Action, the Examiner presents an interpretation of claims 28-31. In paragraph 4, Claims 28-29 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The general gist of the rejection is that the specification only supports use of a plasticized interlayer, since the specification states that unplasticized polyvinyl butyral is not suitable for use in glazing. In paragraph 5, claims 30 and 31 are stated to be duplicates.

Applicant believes that the Action properly describes claims 28-31, as previously presented.

Claim 28 is amended to recite "plasticized" as supported at page 4, lines 14-29. Claims 29 and 30 are cancelled. Claim 31 stands as previously presented.

Applicant submits that these claims are now proper since claim 28 does not read on unplasticized polyvinyl butyral and since claim 31 is no longer a duplicate.

Applicant believes that these amendments should satisfy the Examiner and, if they are not entered, applicant respectfully request that the Examiner indicate why.

Request for Clarification of the Patent Office's Position Concerning 35 USC 103(b)

In paragraph 6, claims 11-27, 32-33 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Frost et al US 5,932,329 ("Frost") in view of Bolton et al US 4,668,574 ("Bolton") with, as evidence, US 5,082,738 ("Swofford").

In the Advisory Action it is stated that the applicant's response does not place the application in condition for allowance because

"Frost et al's adhesive layer is not limited to the plasticized polyvinyl butyral layers as argued. As per Frost et al any thermoplastic material used in the glass laminate can be used (Col. 3, lines 21-24.)"

Applicant presented a detailed response concerning this rejection including technical explanations concerning why the documents cannot be combined. Applicants submit that these arguments are backed by the evidence presented in the specification, and that the evidence demonstrates the unexpected results achieved with the invention. It would be extremely helpful to applicant if the Examiner would be willing to explain the Patent Office's view of these technical arguments, particularly concerning the suitability of the data presented, by providing a clarifying Advisory Action or providing the undersigned the opportunity to conduct an Examiner Interview. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner so clarify the Patent Office position.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the amendments herein should be entered and respectfully request clarification of the Patent Office position concerning obviousness. Should any matters remain unresolved by this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed direct dial telephone number in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark D. Kuller/

Mark D. Kuller
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 31,925
Telephone: (302) 892-1354
Facsimile: 302-992-3257

Dated: April 27, 2007